



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,730	02/14/2002	Karen A. McKirchy	P02293US2	2691
22885	7590	10/14/2009		
MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C. 801 GRAND AVENUE SUITE 3200 DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721				EXAMINER HAILU, TADESSE
				ART UNIT 2173
				PAPER NUMBER ELECTRONIC
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/14/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patatty@ipmvs.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/075,730	Applicant(s) MCKIRCHY, KAREN A.
	Examiner TADEESE HAILU	Art Unit 2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to the amendment submitted on July 1, 2009. The amendment contains claims 1-41. After careful review and fair interpretation of the applicant's claim languages in view of the applied art, Massaro et al., the rejection is maintained by the examiner of record, Tadesse Hailu.

Response to Applicant's arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on July 1, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Massaro pertains to an application, not an instructional program as required in claim 1. The Examiner respectfully disagrees since Massaro's interface provides instructions in guiding the user what to do (see Fig. 3). The applicant's statement labeling Massaro as a word processing application is not a fair reading. The fair reading is that Massaro does teach user will be able to utilize a complex software application, such as an integrated accounting package.

Applicant states that claim 1 does make available **concurrently** to the user two levels of sophistication to assist on **learning** the **concurrently displayed** subject matter [emphasize added by the examiner]. The applicant reading of claim 1 is unfair and incorrect. No where the words "learning", "concurrently", and "displayed" or "displaying" is shown in claim 1. As noted above, Applicant arguments are based on non-claimed features. *As presented by the previous examiner the language "displaying information to be learned and concurrently making available on that same screen either or both*

virtual tutors for immediate enhancement of the learning task" is no where to be found in the claims.

Without considering the above argued but non-claimed wording indicated above, the examiner believes Massaro does read the claimed "*presenting*" step, "*making*" step and *available of the additional instructional options* step of claim 1.

Applicant is respectfully reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

.The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14, 16, 19, 24, 31, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Massaro et al ("Massaro", US 5535321.)

Regarding claim 1, Massaro teaches a method of providing instruction to a user of an instructional program comprising presenting an interactive instructional program to the user via an information processing device (method of displaying help information

matching characteristics of a user) (see column 1, lines 64-67), the program having a plurality of sections related to a subject (the program has several function which is identified by an identifier 24) (Fig. 3); making available to the user additional instructional options to the user related to a section (see levels in Fig. 3); the additional instructional options including information presented to the user in a form perceptible by the user at a first level of sophistication (information presented to the user at basic level), additional instructional information available to the user in at least first and second levels of sophistication, any of the at least first and second levels of sophistication being user selectable, at any time in any order (information presented to the user at basic, intermediate, or advanced levels) (the user can select the levels of sophistication at any time he or she desires, line 63 of col. 3 to line 7 of col. 4).

Regarding claim 2, Massaro teaches that the first level of sophistication comprises information at a first level of comprehension (first level of sophistication is basic level which comprises information at basic level) (see Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 3, Massaro teaches that the second level of sophistication comprises information at a second level of comprehension (second level of sophistication is intermediate level which comprises information at intermediate level) (see Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 4, Massaro teaches that the second level of comprehension is at a higher level than the first level of comprehension (col. 6, lines 10-25).

Regarding claim 7, Massaro teaches the first level of sophistication has short, plain language, summary fashion (col. 6, lines 10-25).

Regarding claim 8, Massaro teaches that the second level of sophistication has long, high educational, more complex language (col. 6, lines 10-25)

Regarding claim 9, Massaro teaches that each level of sophistication has one detail of information attribute that differs from the other level of sophistication. For example, detail of information of basic level is different than the detail of information in expert level (see col. 6, lines 10-25).

Regarding claim 10, Massaro teaches that information is presented to the user in a form perceptible by the user at least a third level of sophistication (information presented to the user at advanced level) (Fig. 3).

Regarding claims 11 and 16, Massaro teaches an apparatus for providing additional instruction to a user of an instructional program (device for displaying help information matching characteristics of a user) (see column 1, lines 64-67) comprising a computer including a digital information storage medium and a software program loaded on the digital storage medium (see Figure 1), the program comprising

- a) interactive instructional information relating to a subject matter (Fig. 3).
- (b) an instruction module including additional instructional options related to the plurality of sections (function), the additional instructional options including additional instructional information available to the user in no less than two levels of sophistication, any of the levels of sophistication being user-selectable, at any time and in any order (information presented to the user at basic, intermediate, or advanced levels) (the user can select the levels of sophistication at any time he or she desires, line 63 of col. 3 to line 7 of col. 4).

Regarding claims 14 and 19, Massaro teaches that the two levels of sophistication include a first level (basic level) comprising a first textual content (information presented to the user at basic level) and a second level (intermediate level) comprising a second textual content (information presented to the user at intermediate level) (Fig. 3).

Regarding claims 24, 31, and 38, Massaro teaches the information comprises instruction related to the subject (col. 6, lines 10-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5-6, 12-13, 15, 17, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Massaro and Cook et al ("Cook", US 5727950).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Massaro teaches at least two levels of sophistication of the help information (basic level and intermediate level). Massaro differs from the claim in that Massaro does not teach that the first level of sophistication comprises a first type of voice and/or the second level of sophistication comprises a second type of voice. However, Cook teaches that plurality of voices/gestures/motions can be used in the tutoring system (help information) (see col 6, lines 13-16) depending on the individual student. These voices/gestures/motions are associated with different help

agents of different levels. For example, "Study Buddies" level are on-screen agents for grade schoolers, and coach level is on-screen agent of an adult (see col 6, lines 1-5). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Cook's teaching of using plural voices associated with plural agents for different help levels to provide first and second type of voices in Massaro's learning system with the motivation being to provide customized, individualized instructional helps to different people.

Regarding claim 12, Massaro teaches at least two levels of sophistication of the help information (basic level and intermediate level). Massaro differs from the claim in that Massaro does not teach that the first level of sophistication comprises a first voice and the second level of sophistication comprises a second voice. However, Cook teaches that plurality of voices/gestures/ motions can be used in the tutoring system (help information) (see col 6, lines 13-16) depending on the individual student. These voices/gestures/motions are associated with different help agents of different levels. For example, "Study Buddies" level are on-screen agents for grade schoolers, and coach level is on-screen agent of an adult (see col 6, lines 1-5). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Cook's teaching of using plural voices associated with plural agents for different help levels to provide first and second voices in Massaro's learning system with the motivation being to provide customized, individualized instructional helps to different people.

Regarding claim 13, Massaro teaches that the two levels of sophistication include a first level (basic level) and a second level (intermediate level). Massaro does not

teach that the first level of sophistication comprises a first character and a second level comprises a second character. However, the use of characters in instructional help technique is known in the art as taught by Cook. Specifically, Cook teaches an agent based instruction system which provide student with virtual tutors or on-screen agents (col 5, lines 21-24). The on-screen agents can appear as living entities appropriate for level of a student (for example, "Study Buddies" are on-screen agents of grade schoolers (first character for first level) or a coach is on-screen agent of an adult (second character for second level)) (see col. 5, line 67 to col 6, line 12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to apply Cook's teaching of using different characters for different levels and/or different students to provide a first character and a second character for the two levels in Massaro's learning system with the motivation being to enhance customized and individualized instructional help method (Cook, col 5, lines 12-19).

Regarding claim 15, Massaro teaches at least two levels of sophistication of the help information (basic level and intermediate level). Massaro further teaches that the two levels of sophistication include a first level (basic level) comprising a first textual content (information presented to the user at basic level) and a second level (intermediate level) comprising a second textual content (information presented to the user at intermediate level) (col. 6, lines 10-24). Massaro differs from the claim in that Massaro does not teach that the first level of sophistication comprises a first voice and the second level of sophistication comprises a second voice. However, Cook teaches that plurality of voices/gestures/ motions can be used in the tutoring system (help information) (see col 6, lines 13-16) depending on the individual student. These

voices/gestures/motions are associated with different help agents of different levels. For example, "Study Buddies" level are on-screen agents for grade schoolers, and coach level is on-screen agent of an adult (see col 6, lines 1-5). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Cook's teaching of using plural voices associated with plural agents for different help levels to provide first and second voices in Massaro's learning system with the motivation being to provide customized, individualized instructional helps to different people.

Regarding claim 17, Massaro teaches at least two levels of sophistication of the help information (entry level and intermediate level) (Fig. 3). Massaro further teaches that help information can include voice (Massaro, col 6, lines 6-13). Massaro differs from the claim in that Massaro does not teach that the first level of sophistication comprises a first voice and the second level of sophistication comprises a second voice. However, Cook teaches that plurality of voices/gestures/ motions can be used in the tutoring system (help information) (see col 6, lines 13-16) depending on the individual student. These voices/gestures/motions are associated with different help agents of different levels. For example, "Study Buddies" level are on-screen agents for grade schoolers, and coach level is on-screen agent of an adult (see col 6, lines 1-5). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Cook's teaching of using plural voices associated with plural agents for different help levels to provide first and second voices in Massaro's learning system with the motivation being to provide customized, individualized instructional helps to different people.

Regarding claim 18, Massaro teaches that the two levels of sophistication include a first level (basic level) and a second level (intermediate level) (fig. 3) Massaro does not teach that the first level of sophistication comprises a first character and a second level comprises a second character. However, the use of plural characters in instructional help technique is known in the art as taught by Cook. Specifically, Cook teaches an agent based instruction system which provide student with virtual tutors or on-screen agents (col 5, lines 21-24). The on-screen agents can appear as living entities appropriate for level of a student (for example, "Study Buddies" are on-screen agents of grade schoolers or a coach is on-screen agent of an adult) (see col 6, lines 1-5). On-screen agents can be characters (col 10, lines 15). These characters are associated with different help agents of different levels. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Cook's teaching of using plural characters associated with plural agents for different help levels in Massaro's learning system with the motivation being to provide customized, individualized instructional helps to different people.

Regarding claim 20, Massaro teaches at least two levels of sophistication of the help information (basic level and intermediate level) (Fig. 3). Massaro differs from the claim in that Massaro does not teach that the first level of sophistication comprises a first voice and the second level of sophistication comprises a second voice. However, Cook teaches that plurality of voices/gestures/ motions can be used in the tutoring system (help information) (see col 6, lines 13-16) depending on the individual student. These voices/gestures/motions are associated with different help agents of different levels. For example, "Study Buddies" level are on-screen agents for grade schoolers,

and coach level is on-screen agent of an adult (see col 6, lines 1-5). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Cook's teaching of using plural voices associated with plural agents for different help levels to provide first and second voices in Massaro's learning system with the motivation being to provide customized, individualized instructional helps to different people.

5. Claims 21-23, 25-30, 32-37, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Massaro.

Regarding claims 21, 28, and 41, Massaro does not teach at least two sections of the program have additional instructional options and the number of levels of sophistication varies between the at least two sections. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Massaro before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the sections, options, and the number of levels of sophistication taught by Massaro to have at least two sections of the program having additional instructional options and the number of levels of sophistication varying between the at least two sections with the motivation being enhance the flexibility of Massaro's system.

Regarding claims 22, 29, and 36, Massaro does not teach at least two sections of the program have additional instructional options and the type of additional instructional information varies between the at least two sections. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Massaro before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the sections, options, and the type of

additional instructional information taught by Massaro to have two sections of the program having additional instructional options and the type of additional instructional information varying between the at least two sections with the motivation being enhance the flexibility of Massaro's system.

Regarding claims 23, 30, and 37, Massaro does not teach at least two sections of the program have additional instructional options and the number of levels of sophistication and type of additional instructional information varies between the at least two sections. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Massaro before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the sections, options, the number of levels of sophistication and type of additional instructional information taught by Massaro to have two sections of the program having additional instructional options and the number of levels of sophistication and type of additional instructional information varying between the at least two sections with the motivation being enhance the flexibility of Massaro's system.

Regarding claims 25, 32, and 39, Massaro does not teach at least two sections of the program have the type of additional instructional information varies between the at least two sections. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Massaro before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the type of additional instructional information taught by Massaro to have two sections of the program having the type of additional instructional information varying between the at least two sections with the motivation being enhance the flexibility of Massaro's system.

Regarding claims 26, 33, and 35, Massaro does not teach at least one section of the program having no additional instructional options. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Massaro before him at the time the invention was made, to modify Massaro's teaching to have at least one section of the program having no additional instructional options with the motivation being enhance the flexibility of Massaro's system.

Regarding claims 27, 34, and 40, Massaro does not teach at least one section of the program having an additional instructional option at one level of sophistication. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Massaro and Cook before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the type of additional instructional information taught by Massaro to have one section of the program having an additional instructional option at one level of sophistication with the motivation being enhance the flexibility of Massaro's system.

CONCLUSION

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and Figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Tadesse Hailu**, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4051. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:30 – 7:00 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kieu Vu, can be reached at (571) 272-4057 Art Unit 2173.

/Tadesse Hailu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173